

Our Three Sons Broadcasting, LLP submits the following comments to the FCC on the proposed LPFM rulemaking:

1. LPFM is NO guarantee that minority ownership will increase. If the FCC makes LPFM •commercial,• licenses will have to be auctioned to the •highest bidder.• But past court decisions have made it IMPOSSIBLE for the FCC to set aside licenses for women or minorities. And once awarded, what•s to keep a minority licensee from selling their LPFM to •the highest bidder ?? • If that happens, aren•t we right back where we started ??

2. The FCC must start considering the •economic impact• of their decisions and stop thinking •the radio industry•s profit/loss is not the commission•s concern.• It is IMPERATIVE that the FCC understand that a LARGE percentage of commercial radio stations in the U.S. today DON•T make a •usable profit !! • So what criteria is the FCC using which indicates LPFM stations are going to survive economically when many of the Docket 80-90 stations aren•t financially viable ?? How SMALL does the FCC think the pieces of the advertising pie can become ?? Why would the FCC want to create a new class of stations that will have little chance to exist economically ??

3. Docket 80-90 already added HUNDREDS of new stations and created enough interference on the FM band for a lifetime. LPFM will only •make a bad problem worse.• In fact, Docket 80-90 created so many NEW stations that the end result was a weakened industry. When the the FCC realized how weak the industry actually was they •moved in to help• by loosening ownership restrictions. But even more help was needed for the radio industry and additional restrictions were lifted by Congress in 1996 through the Telecommunications Act. Docket 80-90 started us •down the road• to consolidation-so why are we about to repeat history again by creating even more stations via LPFM ?

a. Hundreds of ailing AM stations can be purchased for less than the cost associated with putting a new LPFM station on the air. If the FCC wants to increase the number and diversity of •voices on the air,• then why not use abandoned AM frequencies that are already available, and not run the risk of RUINING the FM dial ?? Why doesn•t the FCC take abandoned AM frequencies and allocate this spectrum instead of creating LPFM ?? Existing transmission and studio facilities exist for many of these frequencies and getting them back on-air would certainly be less expensive and quicker than building a new LPFM station from the ground up.

5. The FCC should be EMBARRASSED by today•s state of AM radio. No other service has been allowed to fall into such a state of disrepair. Adding another service (LPFM) when another service (i.e. AM) already exists that •cries out for help• makes little sense. Why does the FCC want to create a new service (LPFM) when one already exists that needs SERIOUS repair ?? Shouldn•t the FCC •fix AM first ?? • Afterall, other broadcasting services are flourishing-why shouldn•t AM radio ??

a. The FCC allows FM radio to use FM translators to improve their signal reach-but AM radio is NOT allowed to do the same-how can this POSSIBLY be justified ?? Allowing AM broadcasters to use FM translators would give IMMEDIATE relief to growing interference problems most AM broadcasters experience every hour of every day.

b. AM broadcasters have been serving their communities LONGER than any other class of service, yet as LPFM is proposed, AM broadcasters will NOT be allowed to purchase LPFM licenses as a means of improving their AM service. Is this fair ?? Yet pirate radio broadcasters who have ceased illegal operations WILL be allowed to apply for LPFM !! How can this possibly be justified ??

c. In the interest of fairness, why doesn't the FCC allow AM broadcasters with 1000 watt stations the opportunity to •trade-in• their stations for 1000 watt LPFM stations. The FCC could then give the 1000 watt AM stations to others seeking access to the airwaves.

6. It just is NOT true that •consolidation• has DECREASED program diversity. As an independent radio broadcasting company on the fringes of a major marketplace, we have seen NO evidence of any decrease in program diversity. Who would have ever anticipated over 500 Spanish language radio stations in the U.S.? Is there a better example of program diversity anywhere else in the world ??

7. Our FM station ALREADY suffers from adjacent channel interference, and we are VERY concerned about ANY rule change that will INCREASE the interference we already have. If eliminating 3rd adjacent channel protection to allow for LPFM won't create interference for existing FM stations then WHY WAS THIS PROTECTION CREATED IN THE FIRST PLACE ?? And the interference problem will ONLY be worse if 2nd-adjacent channel interference is eliminated as well. And what effect will all this have on DAB which is so close to becoming reality ??

8. Perhaps it would benefit the FCC and the broadcasting industry for the FCC to take a •field trip outside of Washington• to meet with average (non-group owned) radio broadcasters who spend 12+ hours a day trying to serve their communities, and to see what ACTUALLY is going on within the radio industry which you are regulating.